## A. Text

Developing countries should adopt the Japanese model. To clarify, developing countries should continue to emit and extract a feasible level of resources. Developing countries should also redirect subsidies for energy sources into R&D for new carbon-neutral fuels. Lomborg ‘13:[[1]](#footnote--1)

The last twenty years of international climate negotiations have essentially achieved nothing. Japan’s courageous announcement that it is scrapping its unrealistic targets and focusing on research and development of green technologies could actually be the beginning of a breakthrough for smarter climate policies. Japan has acknowledged that its previous greenhouse gas reduction target of 25% below 1990 levels was unfeasible, and that it is more realistic its emissions will increase some 3% by 2020. This has predictably invoked critiques from the ongoing climate summit in Warsaw. UN Climate Chief Christina Figueres and EU delegates expressed their regret and disappointment, China was dismayed, while activists called it “outrageous” and a “slap in the face for poor countries”. Yet, Japan has simply given up on the approach to climate policy that has failed for the past twenty years, promising carbon cuts that later don’t materialize or only do so at trivial levels with very high and unsustainable costs. Instead, almost everyone seems to have ignored that Japan has promised to [but will] spend 11 trillion Yen over five years from private and public sources for innovation in environmental and energy technologies. This approach strongly differs from conventional policies to address global warming, and unfortunately it is not even on the agenda in Warsaw: Instead of pouring more money into subsidizing inefficient renewables, we could make much cheaper, but more effective, investments in research and development into new energy sources. As it turns out, this approach is the smartest approach to tackle climate change, and it could particularly help poor countries that rely on cheap energy to power their growth. Japan could – incredible as it sounds – actually end up showing the world to how tackle global warming effectively.

## B. Competition

1. Functional. A) The CP excludes normal means both in policy and in funding. Lomborg TWO:[[2]](#footnote-0)

This approach strongly differs from conventional policies to address global warming, and unfortunately it is not even on the agenda in Warsaw: Instead of pouring more money into subsidizing inefficient renewables, we could make much cheaper, but more effective, investments in research and development into new energy sources.

B) My world doesn't have environmental protection. Lomborg THREE:[[3]](#footnote-1)

Current green energy policies are failing for a simple reason: renewables are far too expensive. Sometimes people claim that renewables are actually cheaper. But if renewables were cheaper, they wouldn’t need subsidies, and we wouldn’t need climate policies.

C) I compete under aims. The CP’s aim is development, not environmental policies. Lomborg FOUR:[[4]](#footnote-2)

Trade-offs are an inherent [in] part of life. We all recognize this from our private budgets. To fix the roof, we may have to accept a [worse] less extravagant summer vacation. When we pick a cheaper wine, we can splurge on dessert. Trade-offs also pervade environmental policy: Cutting more of one pollutant, for example, leaves fewer resources to address other issues. For example, coal is phenomenally polluting, but it also provides for cheap and reliable power, which drives development. Over the past 30 years, China has lifted 680 million people out of poverty, mostly through the use of coal. The average Chinese has become more than 13 times richer.

2. I compete on net benefits. Plus, perms always lose without a net benefit because adding amendments to the neg wastes ink, which costs bank if you’ve ever purchased an ink cartridge.

## Indoor Pollution NB

We need coal to stop indoor air pollution, which is the worse than global warming or war. Only my evidence is comparative. Lomborg FIVE:[[5]](#footnote-3)

The biggest environmental problem in the world is not global warming but air pollution. Most deaths are caused by indoor pollution from cooking and heating with dung and twigs. Over the 20th century, 260 million died from indoor air pollution in the Third World – about twice the toll in all the century’s wars. This is more than 4 times the number who died from outdoor air pollution. As poverty has receded and clean fuels become cheaper, the risk has fallen eight-fold and will probably decline another 70 percent until 2050.

That means we need to extract coal now and then renewables later when they become cheap.

## Warming NB

Current efforts at environmental protection fail wildly. Lomborg SIX:[[6]](#footnote-4)

In China, renewables’ share in energy production dropped from 40% in 1971 to 11% today; in 2035, it will likely be just 9%. Yet we are paying through the nose for these renewables. In the last 12 years, the world has invested $1.6 trillion in clean energy. By 2020, the effort to increase reliance on renewables will cost the European Union alone $250 billion annually. Spain now pays almost 1% of its GDP in subsidies for renewables, which is more than it spends on higher education. At the end of the century, Spain’s massive investment will have postponed global warming by 62 hours. Current green energy policies are failing for a simple reason: renewables are far too expensive. Sometimes people claim that renewables are actually cheaper. But if renewables were cheaper, they wouldn’t need subsidies, and we wouldn’t need climate policies.

The CP is hundreds of times more effective. Lomborg SEVEN:[[7]](#footnote-5)

The world already is spending about 100-billion Yen a day on today’s inefficient renewables — a projected 36-trillion Yen for 2013. But just 10-trillion Yen per year invested worldwide in R&D would be hundreds of times more effective. This is the conclusion of a panel of economists, including three Nobel laureates, working with the Copenhagen Consensus Center, a think-tank that publicizes the best ways for governments to spend money to help the world. Yet in Warsaw, climate summits persist in hoping for a globally-binding agreement on cutting carbon emissions. This was the essence of the failed 1997 Kyoto protocol. Most of the big CO2 emitters (China and India) had no Kyoto-imposed limits, or left the process (the U.S.), or didn’t keep their promises (Canada). Since Kyoto, the will has not been there. After the Durban 2012 talks, India’s environment minister said that “India cannot agree to a legally binding agreement for emissions reduction at this stage of our development.” The day after the conference, Canada withdrew from Kyoto, which Russia and Japan had already refused to extend. Only the Europeans and a few others remain devoted to significant expenses for tiny outcomes. The EU is committed to cutting carbon emissions by 20% below 1990 levels by 2020. This will, according to an averaging of all the available energy-economic models, cost 25-trillion Yen per year. By the end of the century (after a total cost of more than 2,000-trillion Yen), this will reduce the projected temperature increase by a mere 0.05°C. There will be great headlines from Warsaw about pledges, promises and targets. But remember previous “breakthroughs.” At Kyoto, Canada famously promised 6% reduction from 1990-levels, but ended up with a 24% increase. At the Copenhagen summit in 2009, Japan pledged its phenomenal and now abandoned reduction target of 25%. China, likewise, has promised to cut its carbon intensity by 40%-45% of its 2005 level until 2020. It’s a heroic-sounding notion, but International Energy Agency figures show that China is expected to reduce its carbon intensity by 40% without new policies: As its economy develops, China inevitably will shift to less carbon-intensive industries. The trend in human civilization has been to get away from renewables. In 1800, the world got 94% of its energy from renewable, mostly wood and wind. Today, it is just 13%. But much of what is classed as “renewables” means poor people using wood and waste: Africa gets almost 50% of its energy from such sources. China’s renewable energy share, for instance, dropped from 40% in 1971 to 11% today as it became more prosperous. Rich countries install wind turbines and solar panels, which emit less CO2 but remain expensive and [unreliable] provide intermittent power. Spain now spends almost 1% of its GDP on subsidies for renewables — more than it spends on higher education. This is not sustainable, and not something most countries want to emulate. We can’t hope to push through a treaty in Warsaw, or anywhere else, forcing people to dramatically move to more costly, less reliable energy sources. Despite all the summits and the trillions of Yen in subsidies for inefficient green technologies, CO2 emissions have risen by some 57% since 1990. We need to look at a different approach instead of backing the wrong horse over and over again. The economics show that the smartest long-term solution is to focus on innovating green energy through R&D, rather than merely subsidizing its use. Such innovation would push down the [future] costs for future generations of wind, solar and other amazing possibilities. If green technology could be cheaper than fossil fuels, [so] everyone would switch, not just a token number of well-meaning rich people. We would not need to convene yet more climate summits that eventually come to nothing. A smart climate summit solution would instead get all nations to commit spending 0.2% of their GDP – about a 10-trillion Yen globally – on R&D into green energy sources. Analyses show this could solve global warming in the medium term by creating cheap, green energy sources, everyone wants. Instead of criticizing the Japanese government for abandoning an approach that repeatedly failed, we should applaud it for looking at the bigger picture and committing to a policy that could actually fix global warming.

## Econ NB

Cheap energy sources solve poverty. Lomborg EIGHT:[[8]](#footnote-6)

CANBERRA – Trade-offs are an inherent part of life. We all recognize this from our private budgets. To fix the roof, we may have to accept a less extravagant summer vacation. When we pick a cheaper wine, we can splurge on dessert. sTrade-offs also pervade environmental policy: Cutting more of one pollutant, for example, leaves fewer resources to address other issues. For example, coal is phenomenally polluting, but it also provides for cheap and reliable power, which drives development. Over the past 30 years, China has lifted 680 million people out of poverty, mostly through the use of coal. The average Chinese has become more than 13 times richer. sAt the same time, Beijing and numerous other Chinese metropolises are experiencing debilitating smog, reminiscent of London in the 1950’s. About 1.2 million Chinese die prematurely each year because of outdoor air pollution. Measurements from Beijing show that upwards of 16% of the air pollution comes from coal. The World Bank estimates that China’s total annual air-pollution costs – based on what Chinese themselves indicate they are willing to pay to reduce their risk of dying – could be as high as 4% of GDP. sAnd yet the Chinese trade-off has been phenomenally beneficial. In 1982, the average Chinese earned [600] $585 a year; last year, she earned [8,000] $7,958. Meanwhile, the annual per capita environmental cost is $[300]318. So, not surprisingly, most other developing countries [want] would gratefully seize the opportunity to replicate China’s growth pattern – including its pollution. sOf course, the Chinese could do more to cut air pollution. It is estimated that meeting the World Health Organization’s interim standards could reduce damages by $80 per capita. But that pales in comparison to the $600 increase in per capita income in 2013. sNonetheless, many who live in rich countries confidently declare that this trade-off is not in the interest of the poor. The United States, the United Kingdom, and other European countries announced this year that they will not support international finance for coal-fired power plants in developing countries. These countries abstained in 2010 when the World Bank helped finance South Africa’s Medupi coal-fired power plant. Today, they would vote it down. sBut Medupi will provide 10% of South Africa’s electricity and prevent rolling blackouts. As the South African finance minister, Pravin Gordhan, explained, “to sustain the growth rates we need to create jobs, we have no choice but to build new generating capacity – relying on what, for now, remains our most abundant and affordable energy source: coal.” The US government even acknowledged that, without a coal-fired power plant, South Africa’s “economic recovery will suffer, adversely impacting electrification, job creation, and social indicators.” sEnergy poverty is even more acute for the three billion people – almost half of the world’s population – who burn dung, cardboard, and twigs indoors to cook and keep warm. The WHO estimates that while outdoor air pollution in developing-country cities may be ten times higher than in advanced-country cities, average indoor air pollution, caused by burning wood and dung, is a hundred times higher. Indeed, indoor air pollution kills 3.5 million people each year, making it the world’s deadliest environmental problem. sThe world’s three billion energy-poor people need cheap electricity to cook and keep warm. And, for the foreseeable future, that electricity will be generated by fossil fuels. sSome environmental campaigners argue for cleaner stoves. But, while this might be part of the solution, it is essentially telling the poor to live with slightly less polluting open fires in their homes. Moreover, studies indicate that even significant air-pollution reduction starting at high levels will have only a minor impact. sOthers claim that renewables are the way to go. Green energy, especially wind, can indeed help African countries, for example, get some electricity to remote, rural areas; but the grid will do the most good for the most people. According to a recent World Bank study, distributed renewable energy “will be the lowest cost option for a minority of households in Africa, even when likely cost reductions over the next 20 years are considered.” Popular solar lights cost almost $2 per kWh. Using hydro, gas, and oil, the grid cost for the main population centers in Ethiopia, Ghana, and Kenya will likely be $0.16-25 per kWh. In South Africa, where coal powers 90% of electricity, the cost is just $0.09 per kWh. sTrue, electricity from coal will cause extra air pollution. But pollution from indoor air pollution, which would disappear with electrification, accounts for 16% of outdoor air pollution. Even assuming (unrealistically) that coal produces all of the world’s air pollution, we could generate 250 kWh/year with coal for every one of the three billion energy-poor people and still end up with lower air pollution. Moreover, it is easy and fairly cheap to cut coal pollution 90% or more with scrubbers. sFor many opponents of coal, the issue is global warming. According to Christiana Figueres, the United Nations climate chief, coal-fueled development has “an unacceptably high cost to human and environmental health.” She argues that we need to close 75% of the planet’s coal-fired power plants, including all of South Africa’s, because they emit too much CO2. Al Gore’s climate adviser, James Hansen, argues that if we allow developing countries to “come up to the level of the developed world, then the planet is done for.” sYes, the world needs to address global warming (mainly through higher investments in green research and development, and by promoting exploitation of cheap, less-polluting shale gas). But global warming will cause damage worth possibly 1-5% of GDP by the end of the century, when the UN expects developing-world incomes to have risen by 1,400-1,800%. Meanwhile, poverty is killing millions right now, with an impact on global GDP that is likely an order of magnitude higher. And too many people, however well-intentioned, are unwilling to acknowledge the tradeoffs needed to improve poor people’s lives.

## NR

Overview to perms: A) Checking competition makes sense only if you say “well you can also do the nc in the aff world,” but the ac doesn’t only include instances of both the ac and nc, so the ground shift kills fairness. B) Perms decrease clash because they disincentives you from clashing with the benefits of the counter-plan which is far more educational clash than a debate about semantics.
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